

From: [Per-Ola Selander](#)
To: [SR 520 DEIS Comments:](#)
CC:
Subject: 520 comments from the Eastside...
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2006 6:14:39 PM
Attachments:

Any major transportation project will have environmental impacts. During the build phase, as well as when the project is ready, done, and over with.

I visited the meeting in Bellevue and liked what I saw. Do not care to go in to all the details in the EIS (as seem to be the only option on the web site), but in general, here are some

A few comments:

I-1083-001

Great that the bike lanes actually get some decent size. Lanes across I-90 are way too narrow to house bikers. Let alone bikers, pedestrians, strollers, bladers, boarders, etc. Add a little "platform" half-way across the lake that allows bikers/pedestrians to stop and enjoy the view/lake, w/o being in the middle of the bike lane.

Also like the fact that the bike lane seems to be protected by higher concrete "shoulders" that slant upwards, in order to keep the railing a bit away from the actual flow of traffic. The design on I-90 with vertical railing on a narrow bike path is dangerous. I have seen far too many gotten their handle bars caught in the metal railing.

Make the bike lanes as "flat" as possible and as straight as possible. I have a hard time understanding why it needs to weave back-and-forth between north and south side of the highway. Although I think it is a good idea to separate the "through bikers" from the local traffic on Points Loop, even though I must say that there is no or very little local traffic on that one, at least not for now.

I-1083-002

Even though I strongly support a six-lane bridge, for the mere benefits of providing secure access for Transit, I have a hard time understand why the four-

I-1083-001

Comment Summary:

Bicycle/Pedestrian Path

Response:

See Section 2.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1083-002

Comment Summary:

Alternatives Development

Response:

See Section 1.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1083-002 | lane bridge does not get to be "over-decked". That option could be granted any option, even an 8-lane alternative. The more we get the cars down and out of the way, the better it is.

I-1083-003 | The idea of routing traffic via the Pacific Interchange is great. I understand that UW does not like it, but they will likely be less impacted by a better traffic flow over this (smarter) way instead of having congestion over MontLake Bridges.

I-1083-004 | Finally, there are MANY bikers on the Eastside that would bike to Seattle if one did not have to go down over I-90. That is just too much of a detour. I believe it is likely the same the other way, lots of bikers inside the Seattle city limits that'd bike to the Eastside.

And, if biking/walking across the bridge become a successful and popular method of transportation, please make sure that the design is such so 1) a bike lane can be added to the south side of the bridge, or 2) general traffic lanes can be converted to this more "environmentally" friendly mode of transportation.

Per-Ola Selander
10830, 101st Avenue NE
Kirkland, WA 98033
USA
poselander@hotmail.com
+1-425-827-2363 home

I-1083-003

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1083-004

Comment Summary:

Bicycle/Pedestrian Path

Response:

See Section 2.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.